



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/551,037	07/26/2006	Avraham Cohen	032013-128	4020
23911	7590	07/29/2009	EXAMINER	
CROWELL & MORING LLP			MORRIS, PATRICIA L	
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP				
P.O. BOX 14300			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20044-4300			1625	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/29/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/551,037	Applicant(s) COHEN ET AL.
	Examiner Patricia L. Morris	Art Unit 1625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/27/05.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-30 are under consideration in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless —

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (c) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-11 and 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a). (b) and/or (c) as being anticipated by Thakur et al. (*Tetrahedron: Asymmetry* 14 (2003) 407-410) and Thennati et al. (WO 03/089408).

Thakur et al. disclose the instant process of oxidation using hydrogen peroxide catalyzed by WO₃-cinchona alkaloids. Note scheme 3 therein.

Thennati et al. teach the instant catalytic oxidation with an oxidizing agent in the presence of a base and a catalyst comprising vanadium complexed with a chiral ligand. Note claim 1 therein.

Hence, the process is deemed to be anticipated therefrom.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1625

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined teachings of Thakur et al. and Thennati et al. in view of Lutjens et al. (Organometallics 1997, 16, 5869-5878)

As discussed supra, Thakur et al. disclose the instant process of asymmetric oxidation using WO₃-30% H₂O₂ in the presence of cinchona alkaloids. Note scheme 3 therein. Thennati et al. recite the enantioselective catalytic oxidation with an oxidizing agent in presence of a base and catalyst comprising vanadium with a chiral monodenate ligand. Note page 7, lines 13-20, therein. Claim 1 herein recites that any chiral ligand may be employed. However, Lutjens et al. disclose that tridentate ligands may be used in the chemoselective oxidation of sulfides in the presence of vanadium as set recited in claim 12 herein. As here, a sulfide is oxidized by an oxidizing agent in the presence of vanadium or tungsten and a chiral ligand. The reaction of a specific sulphide with an oxidizing agent in the presence of an vanadium or tungsten catalyst

Art Unit: 1625

does not render the process step itself patentable, anew; In re Albertson, 141 USPQ 730, which was specifically reaffirmed on the last page of In re Kuehl, 177 USPQ 250.

One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the process of the prior art with the expectation of obtaining the desired product, because he would have expected the analogous starting materials to react similarly. It has been held that application of an old process to a new and analogous material to obtain a result consistent with the teachings of the art would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-4, 6-24, 26 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the preparation of the enantiomers of tentoprazole or omeprazole, does not reasonably provide enablement for the preparation of any and all unknown benzimidazoles or imidazo-pyridines. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

No support can be found in the specification of the preparation of any and all unknown bezimidazoles or imidazo-pyridines.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 13 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 21, the phrase "preferably" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention.

The expression "derivatives" in claim 1 is indefinite to its meaning.

The term "general" in claims 1 and 13 is indefinite because it suggests that the compounds have other structures not contemplated by applicants.

The claims measure the invention. United Carbon Co. V. Binney & Smith Co., 55 USPQ 381 at 384, col. 1, end of 1st paragraph, Supreme Court of the United States (1942).

The C.C.P.A. in 1978 held "that invention is the subject matter defined by the claims submitted by the applicant. We have consistently held that no applicant should have limitations of the specification read into a claim where no express statement of the limitation is included in the claim": In re Priest, 199 USPQ 11, at 15.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia L. Morris whose telephone number is (571) 272-0688. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Fridays.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Patricia L. Morris/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1625

plm
July 27, 2009